

REMARKS

In the **non-final** Office Action of February 22, 2010, the Office noted that claims 11, 12 and 14-21 were pending and rejected claims 11, 12 and 14-21. In this amendment claims 11, 20 and 21 has been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 11, 12 and 14-21 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office asserts that the Specification does not make definite means for language.

The Applicants have amended the claim to recite "being operable to declare a list of the plurality of use rights expression languages." Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in ¶ 0053 of the printed publication version of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of claim 11.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11-12, 14-18 and 20-21 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Safadi, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0126086 in view of Segur, U.S. Patent No. 6,212,550. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

On pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action, it is acknowledged that Safadi does not disclose "the consultation station including use rights recovery means adapted to recognize use rights expressed in **a plurality of** different languages in order to access said information and **being operable to declare** a list of the **plurality of** use rights expression languages **and to assign** a priority order **to each of the plurality of uses rights expression languages of the list,**" (emphasis added) as in claim 11, but asserted that in "Segur, priority codes are added to the message formats compatible with a device and the conversion of the plurality of messages to a formats recognized by the device is based on the priority codes (See the response to arguments and Segur, Col 1, Line 57 thru Col 2, Line 26 and Col 3, Line 35-52)."

It is respectfully submitted that Segur does not disclose the steps of assigning a priority order to each of the use expression languages recognisable by the consultation station and selecting a language for conversion according to the assigned priority order of each of the use expression languages.

Segur does not disclose a priority ranking associated with the format of the messages. Instead, in Segur the priority

information referred to by the Office relates to the priority of the contents of the message to be converted and not to the format of the message to be converted (see col. 3, lines 44-52). This enables the user to select messages for conversion according to the priority of the contents of the message. The conversion process performed to convert from one data format to another is not at all influenced by the priority ranking of the message. Once a message is selected it is always converted according to the same process (see col 3. lines 55-57) i.e. according to the data format of the subscriber unit.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Safadi and Segur, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 11, 20 and 21 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Safadi in view of Segur in view of Bormans, (NPL, [http://www.chiariglione.org/mpeg/standards/mpeg-21/mpeg-21.htm#\\_Toc23297977](http://www.chiariglione.org/mpeg/standards/mpeg-21/mpeg-21.htm#_Toc23297977)). The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Bormans adds nothing to the deficiencies of Safadi and Segur as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Safadi, Segur and Bormans, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claim 19.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 11, 12 and 14-21 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston/  
James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Reg.No. 55,394  
209 Madison St, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb